

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16-22, 28 and 29 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objections and rejections in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that the drawings are acceptable for examination purposes.

The Specification has been objected to because of various informalities. At page 9, lines 13 and 14 and page 10 lines 1 and 2, the recitations of "publishing system node 203" and of "publishing system node" have been amended to "publishing system node/server node 203". No new matter has been added. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

The trademarks, MICROSOFT, WORD PRO, LOTUS NOTES, and FEDERAL EXPRESS appearing in the Specification have been capitalized. Respectfully, Internet Explorer is not a trademark. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 23, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "referencing the anchor and the object based on respective locations within a meta-document, wherein the meta-document is a collection of the seed document and the at least one hyperlinked document; and publishing the meta-document."

In *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 209 USPQ 1 (1981), the Court noted, "when [a claimed invention] is performing a function which the patent laws were designed to protect (e.g., transforming or reducing an article to a different state or thing), then the claim satisfies the requirements of Section 101." *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 192. In claim 1, a meta-document is a

collection of the seed document and the hyperlinked document having anchors and objects that are referenced within the meta-document. The meta-document is a reduction of a seed document and hyperlinked document into a new document, the meta-document. Further, it should be noted that *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63 (1972) as cited in the Office Action concerned a claim for patenting a formula. Clearly the pending claims are not directed to a formula. Therefore, *Benson* is not believed to be applicable to the pending claims. Thus, at the very least, claim 1 is believed to be directed to statutory subject matter and therefore satisfy 35 USC 101. Claims 3, 4, 6-11 depend from claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be directed to statutory subject matter for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claims 23, 26 and 27 have been cancelled.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 12 and 26 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 has been amended to claim, *inter alia*, "representing the at least one hyperlink" and claim 1 has been amended to claim, *inter alia*, "the seed document comprising at least one hyperlink to the at least one hyperlinked document." Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to provide antecedent basis for the limitations found in claim 8. Accordingly, claim 8 is believed to satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Similar amendments have been made to claims 13 and 19.

Claim 12 has amended to depend from claim 1. Claim 12 claims, *inter alia*, "publishing includes..." Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "publishing the meta-document..." Claim 12 is believed

to satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph, wherein claim 1 is believed to provide proper antecedent basis.

Claim 26 has been cancelled.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Pirolli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,8952,470). The Examiner stated essentially that Pirolli teaches all the limitations of claims 1-22.

Claims 1 and 13 claim, *inter alia*, "referencing the anchor and the object based on respective locations within a meta-document, wherein the meta-document is a collection of the seed document and the at least one hyperlinked document; and publishing the meta-document."

Pirolli teaches a method for analyzing the topology, content and usage of collections of linked documents (see col. 3, lines 17-18). Pirolli does not teach "referencing the anchor and the object based on respective locations within a meta-document, wherein the meta-document is a collection of the seed document and the at least one hyperlinked document" as claimed in claims 1 and 13. Pirolli extracts and stores meta-information of linked pages in a list (see col. 6, lines 17-18). Pirolli does not collect the linked documents, much less include the linked documents in a meta-document. Further, nowhere does Pirolli teach that anchors and objects are referenced within a meta-document, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 13. That is, Pirolli does not support hyperlinks within the list of meta-information. Any hyperlink collected according to the method of Pirolli will point out of the list of meta-information and to a document on the network or internet. Therefore, Pirolli fails to teach "referencing the anchor and the object based on respective locations within a meta-document" as claimed in claims 1 and 13.

Claims 3, 4, 6-12 and 28 depend from claim 1. Claims 14, 16-22 and 29 depend from

claim 13. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 13 respectively. At least claims 28 and 29 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 28 and 29 claim, *inter alia*, “determining a title for each sub-collection accordingly to words occurring in the respective sub-collection, wherein the meta-document is a collection of the seed document and the at least one sub-collection.”

Pirolli teaches the collection of meta-information and the categorization of Web pages (see col. 5, lines 7-8). Pirolli does not teach “determining a title for each sub-collection accordingly to words occurring in the respective sub-collection” as claimed in claims 28 and 29. Nowhere does Pirolli teach that categories of meta-information are titled, much less, that a title is determined for each sub-collection accordingly to words occurring in the respective sub-collection, essentially as claimed in claims 28 and 29. Therefore, claims 28 and 29 are believed to be allowable.


Claims 23-27 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Lapstun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,000). The Examiner stated essentially that Lapstun teaches all the limitations of claims 23-27.

Claims 23-27 have been cancelled.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16-22, 28 and 29, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889